Approved For Release 2005/08/15 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000300040018-1

EXCOM 82-7026 14 July 1982

	MEMORANDUM FOR	R: Executive Committee Members	
25X1	FROM:	Executive Assistant to the DDCI	
	SUBJECT:	Minutes of 8 July 1982 Executive Committee Meeting: Long-Range PlanningTechnical Collection Capabilities.	
25X1 25X1	1. The Executive Committee met on 8 July 1982 to begin Phase III of this year's long-range planning exercise, identifying the capabilities required to meet the intelligence needs projected in Phase II. The DDS&T developed the paper for discussion, Technical Collection and Processing Alternatives. [ExDir] chaired the session; participants included Messrs. McMahon (DDCI); Stein (DDO); Gates (DDI); Fitzwater (DDA); Taylor (ADDS&T); Childs (Comptroller); Glerum (D/OP); and (Acting IG). (AIUO)		
25X1	been driven to Directorates that unlike to capabilities generic capabilities paper and the	Taylor noted that to date, the planning process has by identifying the DDI's needs and what the other need to do to support those needs. He pointed out the DDO or DDI, which could develop specific to meet specific needs, the DDS&T had to deal with polities that could meet a number of needs. CRS/S&T) then highlighted the technical collection are methodology used in developing it. He focused on alternatives that could be most productive,	25X1
25X1	including ar access, quan 3 noting that	reviewed the steps in the planning process, the end result should be guidance for the direction	25X1
	the planning consideratio had a prelim applied to t DDS&T paper views on the	ns. He mentioned his understanding that the DDS&T inary assessment of how technical collection could be he DDI's needs, but it had not been included in the at this point. He then asked for the Committee's paper. (U)	
	4. Mr.	Fitzwater suggested that the paper should reflect	

Approved For Release 2005/08/15: CIA-RDP89-01114R000300040018-1

together into a strategic plan. He suggested that the ties to

some sense of priorities regarding how well each alternative might satisfy the DDI's requirements. He also noted that the recommendations scattered throughout the paper should be drawn

25X1

HUMINT collection capabilities should be spelled out, and he questioned how his Directorate could develop a paper on required support capabilities to address the alternatives discussed in the paper. (C)

- 5. Mr. Gates stated that the paper underscored his concern that technical collection systems tend to develop a momentum of their own that may or may not be related to substantive needs. He noted the lack of a zero-based review, balancing existing capabilities against priority needs and eliminating capabilities that are not addressing priority concerns. He emphasized the importance of linking the DDS&T's generic capabilities to the DDI's substantive needs and concurred with Mr. Fitzwater's comments on spelling out the interplay between technical collection and HUMINT collection. Mr. Stein agreed, stating that DDO and DDS&T had to focus on whether any of the proposed alternatives could fill existing gaps in access to information. (S)
- 6. Mr. Childs observed that the paper represented a useful step in the planning process and an additional step would be necessary to tie the proposed capabilities to the DDI's requirements. Mr. Glerum emphasized the importance of DDO involvement in that next step. Mr. Taylor acknowledged that the DDS&T's proposals should be reviewed to determine their relative importance, relevance and cost. (A/IUO)
- Mr. McMahon noted an imbalance in the paper, finding it strong in those areas of traditional concern to the DDS&T, like technical collection and processing, but weak in those areas where the DDS&T has been less comfortable, such as support to HUMINT collection. He cited the need for more imaginative approaches enhancing the polygraph and improving technical devices to support DDO operations. He requested that the DDS&T spell out the relationship between the proposed alternatives and the DDI's substantive needs and the DDO's HUMINT collection support needs. At a subsequent session the Executive Committee could then determine the relative priorities among the proposed capabilities. Mr. McMahon suggested the DDS&T should also set a figure, possibly 10 percent of its R&D budget, to apply against its own research needs and use its own judgment in determining **(S)** priorities.
- 8. pointed out that during the support phase of the planning process, major information handling projects, including SAFE, would have to be factored into guidance decisions. He noted that this session should be considered informational, and an additional meeting will be held to consider a supplemental paper linking technical collection capabilities to Phase II needs. He then adjourned the meeting. (U)

25X1

25X1